

3

THE COAST SURVEY.



R E P L Y

TO

THE OFFICIAL DEFENCE

OF

ITS COST, ABUSES AND POWER.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

To the Editor of the N. Y. Times:

Whenever a defence of the present arrangement of the COAST SURVEY appears, which is made up of nauseating commendation of the head of that establishment, and indiscriminate abuse of all who believe that his peer may be found among living men, and especially among the officers of our army and navy ; in which feigned issues are met and real ones avoided, and the whole resting upon no foundation but studied and extended falsification and forgery of an antagonist's statements ; dullness itself will not be at fault in determining its authorship. The official reply to the observations of "B. B.," signed "Public Documents," and printed in your issue of 10th ult., so far transcends, in such particulars, all former efforts from that quarter to mystify and pervert the truth, that one might well claim to be excused from answering it at all. Still, in view of its "by authority" character, and because the document tampered with, happens to be not of the sort which will subject the falsifier of it to indictment by a grand jury, the point of exemption will not be pressed. It seems proper to use this occasion, for the further purpose of apprising the Treasury Department, that this vile imposture is circulated under the frank of the Coast Survey, and, in one instance at least, bearing this endorsement : "With the compliments of the

Assistants of the Coast Survey." It may not be amiss for the Department to ascertain at the same time, whether it has not been printed at the same cost which circulates it.

It is very evident, that it is thought necessary at head quarters, to multiply parties to the defence on this occasion, by fraudulently inducing a belief, that the Coast Survey is only one of many defendants. Hence, pains are taken to prejudice the public mind and arouse its fears, by bearing false witness against, not only the sentiment, but even the text of the letters of "B. B." No man can read this official falsification of them, and regard them as anything less than "letters of marque and reprisal," against nearly every respectable man and every respectable thing in the country; and, naturally, it is expected to happen as was intended, that every prominent man and every institution in the land will make common cause against what would seem to be a common enemy. There is nothing in the letters of "B. B." to warrant such a representation of their character or design—it is one of the frauds upon public credulity, which have long served and saved the establishment, and it is expected to do good service again. The candid reader is desired to do, precisely what "Pub. Doc." hopes will not be thought worth while in view of his high position and intense respectability, viz : to try the truth of these conflicting statements by reference to the letters themselves, even at the hazard of a mortifying discovery. In the mean time, the same sort of reader is requested to contemplate without partiality or prejudice, some illustrations of the practices to which the lust of money and of power is able to drive the conventionally eminent and honest, when threatened with the loss of either ; which are added, not more to elucidate the matter in question, than to remind such as have hitherto preserved innocence in high places, that even a heathen taught : "*Facilis descensus Averni.*"

The truth is, the Coast Survey is not attacked at all by "B. B.," nor, to his knowledge, by any body else. In the

very letters thus misrepresented by "Pub. Doc." (on page 4 of the pamphlet copy to which he refers), are these words: "The object contemplated by Congress and by the people, understood to be the aim of the Coast Survey, is laudable enough;" and had the danger of misrepresentation been thought of, the work would have been pronounced indispensable. But, whatever may be conceded as to the necessity of a survey of the coast, nothing of the kind was intended in favor of the great Civil Department which has been engrafted upon it, at an enormous annual cost to the people, "when there are more idle officers upon the pay roll than could be employed upon it." Neither abridgment nor discontinuance of the work is even hinted at by "B. B." Upon this point, the letters can scarcely be charged with ambiguity. The object of "Pub. Doc." will be attained, if he shall be able to delude the public into the belief, that a proposition to cut off the *fungi*, which sap the vitality and deform the symmetry of the Coast Survey, is one calculated to destroy the Survey itself. The work would be injured by it, much in the way a ship might be by having the barnacles removed from her bottom.

"Pub. Doc." begs sympathy, because "the writer sneers at Prof. Bache, for not hazarding the success of this great national work, by mingling with party politics." The diligent are desired to seek in the letters anything to justify the statement; for, the writer having no such belief, can scarcely have had such an intent. A more cunning attempt to excite partisan prejudice against an important question in political economy, than is made by "Pub. Doc." himself, in this very case, is seldom witnessed in real life. "The mode in which it is prosecuted," would become the veriest political rogue that ever appeared upon the boards at Washington; and it is not a little odd, that a political innocent, uses without hesitation, an "artful dodge," from which an ordinary political trickster would recoil. "My lord, this is a poor, mad soul, and she says up and down the

town, that her eldest son is like you," was the "mode" in which one "now in Arthur's bosom, if ever a man went to Arthur's bosom," sought to prejudice the Chief Justice against an honest claim ; and, if "the present honored executive" as much resembles that shrewd functionary, as his informant does Falstaff, he will be likely to reply in the words of the Chief Justice : "I am well acquainted with your manner of wrenching the true cause the wrong way. It is not a confident brow nor the throng of words that come with such more than impudent sauciness from you, can thrust me from a level consideration." Upon page 12 of the pamphlet copy of "B. B." the President and his Cabinet may find what "Pub. Doc." read there, touching the extent of their responsibility for the present conduct of the Coast Survey, in the view of "B. B." He says : "The anomalies which make the Coast Survey odious and expensive, are not chargeable to any political party—hence, it is not the duty of any party, but it is of all parties, to destroy them. *The present administration must sanction and continue them before it can be fairly held responsible for them.* The approaching session of Congress will furnish an opportunity to demonstrate its sentiment in regard to a reform of the abuses of an establishment, which has contributed largely to increase its pecuniary embarrassments. The occasion will be a fit one for the Secretary of the Treasury to express the views of the administration upon the whole subject, in his Annual Report." In the face of so particular a statement by "B. B." upon this particular point, this eschewer of political aid and comfort assures "the present honored Executive, his eminent Cabinet" and Congress, that they are denounced by "B. B." as "accomplices" in whatever swindling there may be carried on under the name and in the livery of the Coast Survey. Some general remarks by "B. B." upon governmental extravagance, are relied upon by "Pub. Doc., " to sustain his misstatement ; but the Chaplain to Congress, who shall preach a sermon upon intem-

perance, may as fairly be charged with affirming the individual drunkenness of each member of that body.

The Secretary of the Treasury is regarded with peculiar dread by "Pub. Doc." His position, as well as his integrity, accounts for this. No other member of the Cabinet has relations or duties towards the Coast Survey so intimate—there is more to be feared from his department than from any other. Hence, it was thought expedient to add a count to the supposititious indictment of "the present honored Executive, and his eminent Cabinet," designed specially to wound the self-respect of the dreaded Secretary. "In what complimentary terms," exclaims "Pub. Doc." he alludes to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is "not the equal of one of his subordinates!" The thought is worthy of the Vicar of Bray himself; but there is a great miscalculation as to the personal qualities of the man designed to be imposed upon. The Secretary will but despise this deceiver, when he discovers, wrested from the context and garbled at that, a remark which ordinary intelligence could not misunderstand. If it had been vague, what is to be thought of one, who, for the words, "The very Secretary, whose subordinate he is in law, is by no means his equal in power and influence," substitutes as quoted, "not the equal of one of his subordinates!" But the sentence is not vague standing alone, and is immediately followed by an illustration of its truthfulness, in these words: "Congress may fail the Secretary—it never does his subordinate." A fact undenied, because undeniable; as fit to be pondered by "the present honored Executive," his Cabinet, Congress, and all to whom these presents may come, as by the Secretary alleged to be overshadowed. When officers, created by the Constitution, are notoriously surpassed in power and influence by their own appointee, it can not be but wise and timely for them to enquire, "Upon what meat doth this our Cæsar feed, that he is grown so great?"

Seeing the main object of "B. B." was to maintain the fit-

ness of the officers of the Army and Navy to execute the work of the Coast Survey, and the expediency of committing it to their charge, under the general supervision of the Secretary of the Navy, there is more than ordinary baseness in this official attempt to deceive those very officers and the public into a belief, that "B. B." sympathizes in the notion and endorses the stale calumny of the civilians of the Coast Survey, that those officers are not equal to that duty. Attempts to overawe by a parade of power, to cajole by flattery and to mislead by calumny the agencies by which alone the hand of reform can be applied to the Coast Survey, are discreditable enough, and the motive is obvious as the means are scandalous ; but essays to array against a measure the identical parties whose credit and advantage are the main designs of it, by rank falsehood sustained by fabricated testimony, altogether surpass them in boldness and perhaps in wickedness.

"Pub. Doc." charges against "B. B." that "He finally resolves upon one more effort, and aims a shot at the army ; because, probably, Professor Bache is a graduate of West Point." The word "finally" shows that "Pub. Doc." was aware of the locality, and the allusion to the "graduate of West Point" that he had read the remarks of "B. B." in this behalf ; and the reader is requested to refer to page 13 of the pamphlet copy and see upon what foundation the charge rests. It will be found as follows :

"The Superintendent himself was a standing refutation of the preposterous assumption, that recourse to civilians was indispensable to the work ; yet, in the face of it, the pretence was made available. Much of the work was then and had been performed by officers furnished by the army and navy, and so their capabilities stood vindicated. The very education, the results of which the Superintendent was selling to the government at six thousand per annum as a civilian, he had acquired as a Cadet, at the cost of that very government. Himself a graduate of West Point, the fitness

of other graduates to do what he professed to do was denied ; as if the capacity of such as continued in the service of the government which educated them, was, by their honorable fidelity made less, but might be enlarged by entering the same service in a civil capacity at a high salary ! The absurdity of this pretence is glaring enough to make it impotent against common sense, but the affectation of belief in it may give baneful potency to the evil practice upon which the fallacy is founded. The practice deserves anything but encouragement at the hands of Congress."

What must be the moral constitution of one capable of assuming such a fact from such statements, or the intellectual which can extract such an inference from such premises ?

It being the custom of the service to require specifications of charges, "Pub. Doc." conforms to the military pattern, and makes specifications of his charge against "B. B." The "shot" itself is quoted, and with apparent fairness "B. B." is condemned "out of his own mouth." It runs thus :

"Our noble spirited volunteers should not again be sent into the field under the command of officers who dig ditches on the wrong side of embankments, and the Mexican war as well as the recent embroilment with Utah demonstrates that we need no standing army." Upon which alleged statements of "B. B." the figure head of the Coast Survey makes this luminous commentary : "What this idea has to do with the mode of prosecution of the Coast Survey, which the writer set out to discuss, is not exactly understood."

"B. B." shares the disability of "Pub. Doc.," and can see no possible good to come to the Coast Survey from a "shot" aimed at the army, and never having seen otherwise denies that he has fired even a blank cartridge in that direction. There is just enough of what "B. B." did say in the traves-ty of it given by "Pub. Doc.," to show that he was entirely familiar with what "B. B." really said, and just enough to

obscure or utterly pervert what "B. B." did say. Now contrast the counterfeit by "Pub. Doc." with the genuine by "B. B.," from the final page of the pamphlet copy. It says:

"The Mexican war, as well as the recent embroilment with Utah, demonstrates that the familiarity of our people with the use of firearms insures us at all times the possession of material for an army, while their spirit and patriotism makes it certain that we need no standing army; the supply of volunteers has always been more than equal to the occasion. The same experience which proves no lack of troops, does, however, betray a want of properly educated officers. Our noble spirited volunteers should not again be sent into the field under command which digs ditches on the wrong side of the embankments. The true policy is to keep our military and naval schools in the highest state of efficiency, and so secure at all times an educated staff for our army and navy. The country will be compensated for the entire cost in the first campaign of the next war, and a more valuable compensation still will accrue to it in times of peace, if it shall commit the Survey of the Coast and kindred enterprises, to the accomplished men who annually graduate in its own academies."

There are few schoolboys among us who are not quite informed, that the remarkable inversion of military art, referred to by "B. B.," is the feat of an officer taken from *civil life*—there are none who could read it in the connection in which it stands and mistake the object for which it is stated. That "Pub. Doc." was either ignorant of the fact, or mistaken as to the purpose for which it was referred to, is not to be presumed in the face of so many evidences of intelligence as his reply discloses; but that same reply furnishes such proof of his utter destitution of moral honesty, as to leave no room to doubt, that both the falsehood and the false quotation are the work of uncommonly intelligent depravity. A bolder or meaner attempt to libel an oppo-

nent and to take judgment by fraud, it is believed, can not be found in the annals of controversy.

It is paralleled, however, by another essay of the same sort, upon the men of science, who "mainly" compose the "National Association for the Advancement of Science." In this case "the Zouaves of the Coast Survey" in the association are made to stand for the association itself; and some descriptive remarks, applicable to but one and that the least respectable society upon the earth, are, deliberately and falsely, applied to the National Association for the Advancement of Science. The audacity of this attempt will be appreciated, if the reader will compare the passages written by "B. B." with those quoted falsely by "Pub. Doc."

"B. B." wrote (see page 11 of the pamphlet copy):

"It is not surprising that an organization which has shown itself able to subdue to its purposes administrations and statesmen of all political parties, and the Congress of the United States, however constituted politically, has found it easy to rule with a rod of iron, an association mainly composed of simple minded men of science, with no aspirations but such as become scholars, and as free from all design to deplete the treasury of the United States as they are full of zeal to replenish the treasury of knowledge. The Zouaves of the Coast Survey in the National Association, united by the "cohesive power of public plunder," have become the scourge of the men of science in this country, and the scorn of the same class everywhere else. Tyrannical, contemptuous and unjust at home, they are insolent and supercilious to the brotherhood of science abroad; the courtesies of the country are declined and its territory is avoided by the most distinguished astronomers of the old world, because their science has such representatives here. Known and derided, under the apposite name of the Mutual Admiration Society, by men of sense throughout the length and breadth of the land, such is the power of the Coast Survey,

that the capabilities for mischief of so mean a society are kept by it unimpaired and unabridged, under universal contempt and disgust. It is intolerable that the church, the state, the army, the navy, art, literature and science, the commerce, the mines, the fisheries, the ship yards and the work shops of the country shall be longer subsidized, at the public cost, to the support of a clique insignificant in number and contemptible in character. If the scientific *status* of that society requires the aids now used, Congress will find it less burdensome to the treasury and more just to the people, to declare, by joint resolution, that it is what its parasites affirm it to be—the depository of what science there may be on this side of the Atlantic, and that no extent of acquirement or of achievement shall establish a reputation for any man, unless he holds its dispensation to that effect. At all events, the power to punish *insubordination*, as all independent opinion is called, without the formality of even a drum head court martial, should no longer be maintained at the public expense, in the hands of one who has had certain notions of *loyalty*, as base and unmanly submission is called, “ground into him by a West Point mill stone.” Something is due to the infirmity of human judgment; and the obtuseness which fails to apprehend in an inflated professor, who has discovered nothing, the superior of a modest one who has discovered ten asteroids, or to discern Bessel *redivivus* in an American counterfeit, may deserve pity, but should be spared punishment.”

It is submitted that without being elegant, the language of the paragraph is plain, yet this contemner of a “low mode of warfare,” renders nonsense for its plainness and false statements for its facts. As before, there are phrases and denominations retained in the forgery, which conclusively prove that “Pub. Doc.” had read for himself what “B. B.” had written of the subject matter, and there are phrases and denominations discarded from it, which prove as conclusively that “Pub. Doc.” at all events, did understand what

was written. With the air and directness of an honest man, he testifies that "B. B." said :

"The assistants of the Coast Survey have become the scourge of men of science in this country, and the scorn of the same class everywhere. Tyrannical, contemptuous and unjust at home, they are insolent and supercilious to the brotherhood of science abroad. The courtesies of the country are declined and its territory avoided by the most distinguished astronomers of the Old World, because their science has such representatives here. Known and divided under the apposite name of the mutual admiration society. Such is the power of the Coast Survey, that the capabilities of mischief of so mean a society as the American Association for the Advancement of Science are kept unimpaired and under universal contempt and disgust."

It may be, that some compositor or proof reader, will be charged with having yielded to an instinct of propriety, by denying the use of capital letters to "the mutual admiration society," and that "divided" was printed for "derided;" but not by corrections of that sort, will the counterfeit be brought to even a remote resemblance to the genuine paragraph. The circumstance that they are typographically alike, in the article in the *Times* and in the government copy, makes it more likely that it was written as printed; that the "society" might elude notice, and its character escape contempt. Time, and perhaps the *Times* will show, whether "the mutual admiration society" is commended to public favor, by this revelation of the tactics which sustain it, or whether it has not hastened the hour, already too long delayed. Power, ill-gotten and worse used, commonly ends its career suddenly and ignominiously; and if *this* "society" survives this demonstration of its eminent head, there will be ground for the belief, that like the Wandering Jew, its infamy is to be denied the refuge of dissolution.

An exceeding blessing vouchsafed to the state of Florida, is made to yield benefactions and benedictions by the

shower upon the Coast Survey. The state itself is largely amphibious, and seems to have been created physically in the interest of that establishment, being made up of little else than coast, and that fit for nothing so much as to be surveyed. It bristles with keys, exactly fitting the locks of the public treasury; which keys are at present kept by the Coast Survey. Never having been in hands better for the interests of the state, it is quite natural that Florida should seek to keep them there; and discerning signs of perpetuity in the Coast Survey, not to be found in any other institution of the government, and perhaps not in the government itself, it is just as natural that the state should regard it as the only organization which promises to be as enduring as its needs.

That the representative of a state, so regarding an establishment, should speak in its praise, and strive to make such states as "do not feel its benefits," believe that of all they are the most benefited, is almost a matter of course; and, therefore, no surprise ought to be felt, that Senator Mallory of Florida, "during the last session of Congress—in open session," did so natural a thing. "Pub. Doc." quotes some of his remarks, and it is not to be denied, they do not harmonize with the representations of "B. B." of views entertained regarding the Coast Survey, by "legislators like Benton, Mallory and Cushing." The incongruity is caused, however, by nothing but a jugglery of the principal Fakir of the establishment; and the real wonder is, that Benton and Cushing escape being paraded as eulogists of what neither lost an opportunity to denounce, so long as he was in public life.

This unscrupulous falsifier of "B. B." says: "Senator Mallory is also mentioned by this writer, as an opponent of the Coast Survey. During the last session of Congress, that distinguished Senator, in the course of a debate on the Coast Survey, in open session, made the following remarks," &c. It is no disparagement to him, whatever it may be

to "B. B." to say, that the latter's first knowledge of Senator Mallory came from "Pub. Doc." himself; and had not confirmatory documents been "available," at this hour "B. B." would be incredulous as to the existence of that Senator. Not a man in the nation knew better than "Pub. Doc." that Francis Mallory of Virginia, the colleague of Cushing in the Committee on the Coast Survey, in 1842, was the "legislator" of that name referred to by "B. B.;" nor will a man in the nation doubt it, after reading the letters of "B. B.," and these illustrations of the utter want of truth and honor in him who has falsified them. Not content with the use of this basest of all forms of falsehood, to convict his adversary of a misstatement of fact, "Pub. Doc." *improves* upon the circumstance in this wise: "His egregious blunder, in referring to the Senator from Florida, betrays his ignorance of the subjects he attempts to discuss"—the logic of which proposition is about equal to the honesty which suggested it; and exhibits "Pub. Doc." quite as ready to play fool as rogue to maintain the Coast Survey, its cost, abuses and power, unimpaired and unabridged.

The consciousness of power "to wrench the true cause the wrong way," felt by the Coast Survey, may be measured by the indifference to the commonest requirements of fairness displayed by "Pub. Doc.," and by the manifest contempt he has for any consequences to come from detection and exposure. In the evident belief, that "the image and superscription" of the Coast Survey will cause to pass current, against the letters themselves, his elaborate perversion and falsification of them, he hesitates not to misrepresent the general tenor of the letters of "B. B.," as well as their particular statements. With the positiveness of one who knew what he was talking about, this libeler attempts to beguile his readers into the belief, that "B. B." fairly stultifies himself thus: "The Superintendent of the Coast Survey," says the writer, "is so highly esteemed as a scien-

tific man, and has performed his public duties so well, that no one will listen to my abuse of him, and defenders are sure to rise up whenever he is attacked ;" and elsewhere "Pub. Doc.," lying to the same point, strives to represent "B. B." as saying that the Superintendent's "highest crime" is, "that he has accomplished his public duties to the satisfaction of his country." "B. B." is as innocent of such opinions, as his letters are of statements at all calculated to sustain them. Whatever might be said upon an issue touching the manner in which the Superintendent has discharged his *official* duties, no such issue was raised by "B. B." If any functions of his are alluded to, it will be very clearly seen they are not in the remotest degree *official*. Besides, if it be in the power of "B. B." to show that the ceaseless adulation poured upon the Superintendent is altogether undeserved, he could not be forced or coaxed into doing so on this occasion.

If the proposition were to change the head of the Coast Survey, such an issue would be inevitable ; but such is not the proposition, nor has such been the direction of effort. The best of all reasons for changing the Superintendence might not be good ones for altering the Organization : while, on the other hand, reform of the establishment would very likely provide every thing necessary to that end—the greater would include the less. The measure of reform proposed goes to abolish utterly the anomalous, unconstitutional, yet powerful civil department, which has been noiselessly and insidiously engrafted upon the original plan to survey the Coast ; and to remand the entire business of the Coast Survey to officers of the army and navy, under the general supervision of the Secretary of the Navy. It is a characteristic belittling and mystifying of the real question, to treat it as one whether the present Superintendent has performed his official duties well, or ill, or at all. If in the course of events, however, that question shall arise, "Pub. Doc." may rest assured it will not be avoided.

Disingenuous always, "Pub. Doc." represents "B. B." as "glad to escape from a discussion of the scientific and commercial character of the Coast Survey." Why should "B. B." be "glad to escape from a discussion" of what neither he nor anybody else controverts? "Pub. Doc." himself is not more convinced of the propriety and utility of a survey of the coast than is "B. B." and if the Coast Survey *per se* is attacked from any quarter, "B. B." will feel bound to defend it by all lawful and righteous means, as zealously as "Pub. Doc." defends the "cost, abuses and power" of the present arrangement of it, by weapons never found in honest hands. The necessity of a survey of the coast is conceded on all sides. It is only the notion, that the continuance of the work is impossible under any other system or auspices than those which now control it, that is scouted and derided. "Servility and interest" have so extensively and diligently circulated that notion that mere iteration has warped the public judgment in regard to it; but if the confessors outside the pale of "servility and interest" are asked a reason for such a belief, it will be found to rest upon no conclusions of their own minds. The idea is unphilosophical in theory, and untrue in point of fact. "There are as good fish in the sea as have ever been caught;" and the army and navy have as competent officers remaining in the service, as have ever been taken from it by the superior pay and emoluments of the civil service of the government.

Perhaps it may be allowed even by the "mutual admiration society," that the present Superintendent is at least mortal; and what does not threaten the Survey in view of this fact? Would it be less than wise to determine by actual experiment, while the Superintendent abides in the flesh, whether a survey of the coast without his superintendence be a practicable thing? If it should turn out that this work and the life of this Superintendent are coterminous, he might be restored, and the whole energies of the

country concentrated in an effort to finish the work before the light of science should be extinguished forever. It is not pleasant to think that, by so slender a thread as a single human life, hang so important things. Such as are hopeful enough to expect the world to go on without the present Superintendent—without the Smithsonian Institution—and without the Nautical Almanac, may be properly left to the consolations of such a belief; but humanity comes in aid of prudence and seconds the demand, that something be done to save from despair such as, like Fluellen, have no hope of the world but in “Alexander the Pig.”

Apochryphal as may be, “B. B.’s” gladness to escape from such a discussion, there can be no doubt that the sorrow of “Pub. Doc.” is real—that the question is not what he falsely represents it to be. He affects to raise the question as to the “scientific and commercial character” of the Coast Survey himself, and by that motion reveals how it would have been met had it been in the case. It is a fair illustration of the ethics which govern the Coast Survey, as well as of the tactics by which its present dominion has been acquired, and by which it is expected to be sustained.

“Pub. Doc.” says: “Mr. Hassler contended for a quarter of a century against overwhelming difficulties, and only operated from one centre. It is not surprising that Congress should have become anxious to advance more rapidly.” In the same connection he says: “At the time Mr. Hassler was asked whether he could finish the coast with his *small* allowance of \$100,000 in twenty years, the only charts then in use on our coast, were those made by British vessels, and by the enterprising firm of the Messrs. Blunt, of New York.” The object of such statements as these is very plain, nor does the Coast Survey ever lose an opportunity to aid it by repeating them. It is for no purpose but to disparage the achievements of Hassler by suggesting unfair comparisons between them and those of the present Superintendent. Hence the sly remark, “It is not surprising that Congress should

have become anxious to advance more rapidly"—an anxiety hardly attributable to anything else than that Hassler's progress had been slow. This all proceeds upon the assumption that no one will call to mind the fact, that nearly the entire of Hassler's extensive and valuable results were accomplished in less than one half of a quarter of a century. All the term during which the work had no existence except in acts of Congress, the years Hassler spent in Europe to procure instruments for the work, are meanly counted against him as years spent in the field. The entire appropriations for the first twenty-five years are but \$73,900. It was Congress that was slow—it was Hassler who was anxious.

In 1832, Hassler was first fairly allowed to proceed, and then upon the meagre appropriation of \$20,000. It was not until 1840 he enjoyed an annual appropriation of \$100,000, and the entire appropriations to the Coast Survey, "at the time Mr. Hassler was asked," &c., amounted to \$793,900. The Coast Survey method of impressing the public with the idea that Hassler's labors were nugatory, is so to state some other fact as to make such a deduction possible. On this occasion, it is alleged that "at the time," &c., "the only charts then in use on our coast were those made by British vessels, and by the enterprising firm of Messrs. Blunt of New York." Done into Coast Survey English, all this means that up to 1842, for then was the time when "Mr. Hassler was asked," &c., by Caleb Cushing—and, as Hassler died in 1843, it may as well be said, at the time of his death, after laboring a quarter of a century from only one centre, he had produced nothing. The truth, however, is, Mr. Hassler contended with difficulties which the present Superintendent has never encountered, and in less than twelve years of actual labor, he accumulated a capital of results upon which the Coast Survey has traded from that day to this. Maps made and engraved, under his superintendence, survive him, and any of Hassler's assistants will see in the

tail now flaunted by the Peacock of the Coast Survey, the feathers *borrowed* from Hassler.

The rise and progress of appropriations to the Coast Survey, under the requisitions by Hassler and Bache respectively, was illustrated by a detailed statement of them, which may be found at pages 4 and 5, of the pamphlet copy of "B. B.'s" letters. It was followed by some moral and economical reflections thereon, the object of which, it was thought, was entirely unmistakable. Somehow, "Pub. Doc." contrives to be regularly bothered by it. He does his best to make the intent either false, or obscure to others as he pretends it to be to himself, nor can it be denied that he has succeeded. So much of what he says in this relation, as can be understood at all, is false; and there is neither sense nor meaning of any sort left in the remainder. Hear what he says: "We have said that this writer does not allude to the progress of the Coast Survey. He does, however, in one place present a masterly comparison of the progress under Professor Bache during the last fourteen years, with the work executed by the first distinguished and honored Superintendent, Mr. Hassler. He says: 'In 1842, the Select Committee of Congress asked that distinguished man, 'Do you think that under the most favorable circumstances, and with a continuance of a yearly appropriation of \$100,000, the survey of the coast can be completed in twenty years?' He replied, 'Perhaps.'" The good old man—peace to his memory—did not wish to say no; but he expressed his doubts in the strongest language at his command, and added, "The progress is slower at first, but the means increase as the work proceeds." "Mark," says this letter writer, fourteen years afterwards, "how the theory of Hassler and the practice of the present Superintendent repel each other; as the means increase, progress is slower, is the mode of Professor Bache." He evidently calls attention to something following, with regard to the progress of the survey, or its mode of prosecution, but

having no "documents available, suddenly leaves the subject without further comment."

Nothing can be further from the purpose of B. B. in making the comparative statement and the remarks thereupon, than is the purpose imputed to him by "Pub. Doc.;" unless it be granted, that by "the work executed by the first distinguished and honored Superintendent Mr. Hassler," and by "the progress under Professor Bache during the last fourteen years," nothing is to be understood saving and excepting their respective levies upon the Public Treasury. If it be the respective labors of those men in that department of effort which is the subject of contrast, "B. B." concurs in the judgment of so skillful a sapper and miner of the Treasury as "Pub. Doc.," that it is "a masterly comparison." How "the work" of Hassler appears beside "the *progress* under Professor Bache!" After a connection of some sort with the survey of *thirty five years*, the total of appropriations for Hassler's "work" is \$893,900; while such has been "the *progress* under Prof. Bache during the last *fourteen years*," that the total appropriations for his "*progress*" are \$4,221,-110! If the *comparison* be "masterly," what word will properly characterize the *feat*?

The attempt to conceal the meaning of the question referred to in the quotation, and Mr. Hassler's reply to it, is characteristic, but will not succeed. The examiner, who put the question and heard Mr. Hassler's answer, is alive, and no doubt, will, if requested, assure "Pub. Doc," that both Mr. Hassler and himself were in full possession of their senses. The fact is, and will stand forever, that Mr. Hassler only *doubted* whether a survey of the then coast of the United States could be completed in twenty years, at a total cost of \$2,000,000? A more fearless witness than Mr. Hassler has never been under examination anywhere, and he was just the last man then alive of whom it can be said, he "did not wish to say no, but he expressed his doubts in the strongest language at his command," when his conviction

54
was that "no" was the proper answer. There can be no doubt that Mr. Cushing's question approximated so nearly to Mr. Hassler's own idea of the term and cost of the survey, that Mr. Hassler was not able to say positively that twenty years and two millions of dollars were not sufficient for the purpose. It is to be expected that some pains will be taken to mislead the public on this point, by an establishment which has within the last two years consumed as much of the public funds as Mr. Hassler would have needed in twenty years to complete what even now is only begun.

It almost exceeds belief, that such a medley of words as the quotation from "Pub. Doc.," now under examination, could be suggested from statements, so plain as those of B. B. upon which the paragraph is obviously founded. The statements may be found at page 5 of the pamphlet copy of B. B. letters, and are as follows :

"It is doubtful if our language can furnish words which will so well describe the peculiar talent of the Superintendent, or so well illustrate his skill in applying it, as do these figures. Means are not at hand to determine whether the appropriation of \$100,000, in 1843, was made upon his requisition or upon the estimate of his predecessor; but the modest \$80,000, of 1844, was undoubtedly of his own projection. How the appointing power must have felicitated itself upon the acquisition of a Superintendent who seemed to promise improvement upon the economy of Hassler! In 1842, the Select Committee of Congress asked that distinguished man, "Do you think that, under the most favorable circumstances, and with continuance of a yearly appropriation of \$100,000, the survey of the coast can be completed in twenty years?" He replied, "Perhaps. The progress is slower at first, and the means increase as the work proceeds." Mark how the theory of Hassler and the practice of the present Superintendent repel each other; and how the one has misused the peace, conquered by the other, for the Coast Survey. It was at that session Hassler vindicated

the utility of a survey of the coast, with such power that not even the management of the present Superintendent has as yet neutralized it."

"The progress is slower at first, and the means increase as the work proceeds," is the rule of the founder of the work, and the ablest administrator ever connected with it. As the work proceeds and the means increase, progress is slower and the cost increases—is the mode of his successor. The show of economy and retrenchment begun and ended with 1844. Year by year, as he was able to entrench and fortify his position by increase of the patronage of his own department, and by procuring the control of the patronage of others, the appropriations of the Coast Survey have grown, until, after fifteen years *increase of means*, the important element in Hassler's estimate, half a million no longer serves for the expenses of a single year; and, during his term, Congress has granted to the Coast Survey the enormous amount of four millions three hundred and twenty-one thousand one hundred and ten dollars!"

"But since Professor Bache was placed in charge of the work," says "Pub. Doc.," "our sea coast has been more than doubled in extent by the admission of Texas and the acquisition of California, and these parts of the coast now require the heaviest expenditure. Yet, with all this accumulation of labor, what is the comparative cost? The average yearly expenditure has been, during late years, only about \$300,000, and the work is in active progress from the eastern boundary of Maine to the northern boundary of our Pacific possessions; and it is estimated, from the progress of these late years, that the Atlantic and Gulf coasts will be essentially completed in twelve years more."

It will not be easy to find later years than those which immediately precede the present one, and the annual appropriations by Congress alone, to the Coast Survey for eight of them, are repeated from "B. B."

1850,	\$421,000
1851,	310,000
1852,	406,110
1853,	386,000
1854,	386,000
1855,	445,000
1856,	500,000
1857,	545,000
	—————
	\$3,399,110

Coast Survey arithmetic from such figures makes the average yearly expenditure, "during late years, only about \$300,000!" It is scarcely possible, as one reads that "it is estimated, from the progress of these late years, that the Atlantic and Gulf coasts will be essentially completed in twelve years more," to repress a mental calculation, that the Treasury will be at ease after it shall have disbursed \$3,600,000 more to the survey of those coasts!

If it had been the purpose of "Pub. Doc." to do anything but to befog the question of cost, and to salve it by suggesting a hope of the beginning of an end, which no experience warrants, he would not have ignored an element of cost which "B. B." had put forth prominently, as this; (see page 8 of the pamphlet copy): "If the appropriations by Congress covered the entire cost of the Coast Survey, it would be enough to demand a review of its expenses with a view to abridge them; and if the amazing increase of cost in the latter years be considered, investigation would seem indispensable. They comprise, however, only the sums appropriated *directly* to the Coast Survey. Its indirect levies upon the public property and funds *are believed to be much greater.*" It was quite bad enough to understate the annual appropriations only by about \$125,000 per annum; but to assume a correct average of them as indicating the annual cost of the survey, would relieve the matter very little in the teeth of "B. B.'s" declaration, that its "*indi-*

rect levies upon the public property and funds are believed to be much greater" than the appropriations made by Congress *directly* for its benefit. The real cost of the work is about the last thing the confraternity desires to see; still, it is hoped there is spirit enough in the present Congress to call upon the War and Navy Departments to furnish the amount of value contributed by them, respectively, to this work. This, added to the congressional appropriations, will furnish a total of cost for a basis of comparison with parallel works in other countries, for which purpose only "Pub. Doc." seems to think it worth while to compute the cost at all. Whenever that shall be done, it will be found that a million and a half per annum is more likely to be the American term in the comparison, than "only about \$300,000."

If the element of cost be eliminated from the mass in which it is now hidden, the public will be better qualified than now, to decide how much truth there may be in the allegation of "Pub. Doc.," concerning the figures of cost, that, "when compared with the work accomplished, they show the most remarkable economy ever attained in a national undertaking of this character, as a comparison with foreign surveys will show." Then too, if a comparison of the kind in question be entered upon, it will be only fair to see that it is between works, in some respects analogous. Contrasts of cost between a survey of the coast of the United States, and a trigonometrical survey of the Empire of Austria prove nothing in regard to the economy of either.

The object of "Pub. Doc." in suggesting and making "a comparison with foreign surveys," is plain enough, but the way in which he contrives not to do what he seems to do, is rather amusing. A comparison of the cost of our coast survey with the hydrographic expenditures of foreign countries, would have disgraced him, although the cost of the American had been lied down to only about \$300,000 per annum. The kernel of hydrographic cost must be present,

but there was a chance to obscure it by chaff from trigonometrical surveys of foreign territory, which did not touch the sea.

“Pub. Doc.” who uses ink with the alacrity and purpose of the cuttle fish, gravely says: “The trigonometrical survey of the British Islands was commenced in 1791, and had cost up to 1856, \$12,000,000, and it is estimated, that \$8,000,000 more will be required for its completion. This expenditure is exclusive of \$17,000,000, commencing in 1837, for parish maps. The whole number of persons employed in the trigonometrical survey in 1840, was three thousand five hundred.”

“The surveys of France have been in progress nearly one hundred years. The new map was commenced in 1818 and is now only two thirds finished.”

“The cost of both the French and English land work, is about five times the cost of ours; and there have been employed on the new map of France, since its commencement, twenty-five hundred persons, men of education, besides the laborers. Austria has expended \$500,000 annually, for the last seventeen years in her trigonometrical survey, and contemplates an increase of yearly expenditure.”

“All this may possibly be true; but true or not, what has it to do with the matter in hand? There is no denying that the Coast Survey is innocent of some large expenditures, of which “the trigonometrical survey of the British Islands” appears to be guilty. The Coast Survey has not expended “\$17,000,000, commencing in 1837, for parish maps,” and in that respect is so much cheaper; yet there seems no especial merit in this, seeing “the trigonometrical survey of the British Islands” was nothing but a survey of parishes, and it might well make maps of its own surveys. The Coast Survey might as well build parish churches as make “parish maps.” The matter of the map of France, and the survey of the Austrian Empire are as much in point as the parish maps—neither the one nor the other, having any connec-

tion whatever with the matter pretended to be under comparison. If the cost of a riparian survey of James River, be contrasted with the cost of a trigonometrical survey of the territorial area of Virginia, a parallel process to settle a question of comparative economy will be performed.

Under this mass of irrelevant non-parallelisms, some scanty allusions to hydrographic surveys appear, which like the water sometimes discerned under superincumbent floodwood, seem clear enough until disturbed. It is obvious they are put there unwillingly. "The hydrographic surveys of England" says "Pub. Doc." have cost in the last twenty years \$10,000,000, the average number of persons employed yearly in these surveys, being fifteen hundred. This is exclusive of the English Arctic and Antarctic expeditions. The hydrographic survey of the British Islands is still incomplete, on account of a want of cooperation with the land work." "The first sounding lead was thrown in St. George's Bay, in 1836. * * The length of the coast of France is about 600 miles only, and its survey required twenty-eight years for its completion. The cost of the hydrography of France, alone, since 1834, has been \$4,300,000." * * "All the governments of Europe possessing sea coasts, have either finished or are now making complete surveys of their coasts, besides trigonometrical surveys of their whole territories."

The information contained in the preceding sentence is grateful to all, and honorable to the governments mentioned, and can scarcely fail to encourage men everywhere to continue surveys already begun and to inaugurate new ones. There is nothing like surveying!

The most remarkable feature of the Coast Survey of France is, *that it is finished*. Twenty-eight years and \$4,300,000, it is said, were expended upon hydrography. The art of government, in that country, is said to consist in extracting money enough from the whole people to buy, under the form of employment by the government, a sufficient number of them to overawe the rest. Now, for such

a system, the support of hydrographic surveys for twenty-eight years, at a cost of \$4,300,000, is moderate indeed. Our own Coast Survey has had an equal amount from Congress alone, in just half as many years, and that is but part of its cost. France is more likely to be envied than imitated, on this side the water.

“The hydrographic surveys of England,” “Pub. Doc.” says, “have cost in the last twenty years \$10,000,000, the average number of persons employed, yearly, in these surveys, being fifteen hundred. This is exclusive of the English Arctic and Antarctic expeditions.” The annual expenditure of Great Britain for this purpose is half a million of dollars, and therefore the whole cost of it, annually, is about equal to the extra-departmental cost of the U. S. Coast Survey—in other words, probably less than half the cost of our own survey. Perhaps the Coast Survey is entitled to the benefit of a set-off to the “English Arctic and Antarctic expeditions ;” admitting which, it may be stated, that the Coast Survey of these states costs twice as much, annually, as “the hydrographic surveys of England,” and that this is exclusive of the South Sea and Japan expeditions.

“Pub. Doc.” takes it upon his honor to state, that “the English employ constantly between two and three thousand persons on their land work alone, while on the United States Coast Survey, in both the land work and hydrography, taking the officers of the army and navy and *seamen* of the navy all into account, the number will not reach one-third of the force employed on the English land work.” The material fact affirmed by this statement, is, that the number of persons, of all grades, employed upon the U. S. Coast Survey, “will not reach one-third” of “between two and three thousand persons.” The circumstance that the latter are employed on “land work” is of no consequence whatever. They might as well be engaged in the collieries of Wales, and they would come quite as near harmonizing in

occupation, with the employees of the Coast Survey. A careless reader is expected to be entrapped into the notion, that the "two or three thousand persons employed on the English land work" are busy surveying coasts, which is false; and that the U. S. Coast Survey is prosecuted with less than "one-third" of that number of persons, which is also false. There is an analogy between "the hydrographic surveys of England," and our Coast Survey, and "Pub. Doc." illustrates his lack of the sort of memory needed but not always possessed by his class, by forgetting that, in another connection, he had revealed his knowledge of the number actually employed upon those surveys, and that he of all men had least occasion to impress into his service "the force employed on the English land work." The words of "Pub. Doc.," in relation to this point, are: "the average number of persons employed, yearly, in these surveys, being fifteen hundred." The true state of the case, then, is, that the "hydrographic surveys of England" are performed by fifteen hundred persons, at an annual cost of five hundred thousand dollars.

To make foundation for a reproach to B. B., "Pub. Doc." contributes an item of information thus: "We will add, for the information of those who may chance to read these papers, that the writer omitted, probably through ignorance, to add to the thirty-seven officers enumerated, two hundred laborers who are usually employed with the field parties." The ignorance is confessed—"lucus a non lucendo" is a compensation not always achieved by it. Besides, since the commencement of this controversy, the Coast Survey has thrown its annual "tub to the whale." It may be found in your paper of Nov. 25, 1858, under the head of "Naval Intelligence," and is entitled "Operations of the Coast Survey." Among other interesting matters a humorous but graphic account of a division of its fleet is given in these words: "In the work of triangulation and topography of the coast of the United States there are some twenty schoon-

ers employed under the supervision of Prof. A. D. Bache. These vessels vary in size from twenty to one hundred and fifty tons, and are generally of light draft to admit of their operating in shoal waters. They each carry, besides an effective crew, a complete surveying party, making from thirty to forty men each. The presence of these "long, low, black schooners" off the headlands and harbor entrances of the coast sometimes give rise to suspicions that there are slavers about." Not less than than 800 persons are sometimes suspected of being what they are not, because they are on board these vessels.

By the same bulletin it appears, that 7 steamers and 3 sailing vessels are to be added to the Coast Survey Navy. The crew of one of these vessels only is enumerated, to wit: "The tender, Varina, is about 130 tons and carries some 60 men." Perhaps it will be fair to say that these ten vessels carry 500 persons.

Now, if, to the 237 persons confessed through malice, we add the 800 and the 500 paraded through boasting, we have a total, from data furnished by the Coast Survey itself, which disposes at once and forever of the false pretense set up by "Pub. Doc.," that, "on the United States Coast Survey, in both the landwork and hydrography, taking the officers of the army and navy and *seamen* of the navy all into account, the number will not reach one-third of the force employed on the English landwork, &c.," which force he puts at "between two and three thousand persons." And that total, it will be recollect, is to be aggravated by the number drafted from the War Department!

"The United States have an extent of coast greater than that of any two nations of Europe, a coast abounding in dangers, &c.," says "Pub. Doc.," with the obvious intent of suggesting to the reader that the U. S. Survey embraces more coast than is possessed by England and France together; and that it is increasedly dangerous in character. The notion, that "the hydrographic surveys of England"

are confined to the coast of the island alone, is attempted to be strengthened, by the exclusion of "the English Arctic and Antarctic expeditions;" to which the courteous reader is expected to refer the colonial and foreign surveys of that government. The whole of this is an effort to belittle "the hydrographic surveys of England," and to magnify the objects and performances of the U. S. Coast Survey, and the whole is false and fraudulent toward the public.

There is nothing but fraud in an attempt to confine the hydrographic surveys of the power, "whose morning drum-beat salutes the rising sun, and, keeping company with the hours, encircles the globe with the martial airs of England," to the coasts of the circumscribed island which is the seat of that stupendous sovereignty. Let one "take the wings of the morning and fly to the uttermost parts of the earth," and he shall find it easier to meet than to avoid the hydrographers of England. "The hydrographic surveys of England" are, nearly, the hydrography of the world; and the Admiralty will produce this day a better chart of the entrance to the harbor of New York than any projected by the present Superintendent of our own Coast Survey; and not only the best but the only charts of other coasts, so remote and unfrequented that they are known to the U. S. Coast Survey only by name. Our own line of coast, elongated as it is, is not to be compared in extent with the endless one contemplated by "the hydrographic surveys of England."

At the hazard of again arousing the ire of "Pub. Doc.," a further quotation, pertinent to this comparison, will be made from "one who, being dead, yet speaketh," the late Thomas H. Benton. "Pub. Doc." says of him: "That Senator gained *but one vote*, besides his own, in *a full Senate*, and when he was returned to the House, virtually abandoned his position." The fact last stated is merely libelous; the one first stated is good evidence of the truth of "B. B.'s" allegation, "that, in point of strength and efficiency, the

Court Survey was superior to the highest abilities, supported by great popularity, in positions of dignity and power." Among the last labors of the departed statesman was the preparation of his "Thirty Years in the U. S. Senate;" and he is a bold man who charges that he "virtually abandoned his position," when it is re-stated by him therein so recently as 1856. At page 726, of II Vol., "Thirty Years, &c.," the reader will find as follows:

"Mr. BENTON. My object, Mr. President, is to return the Coast Survey to what the law directed it to be, and to confine its execution, after the 30th June next, to the Navy Department. We have now, both by law and in fact, a Bureau for the purpose—that of Ordnance and Hydrography; and to the hydrographical section of this Bureau properly belongs the execution of the Coast Survey. It is the very business of hydrography; and in Great Britain, from whom we borrow the idea of this Bureau, the hydrographer, always a naval officer and operating wholly with naval forces, is charged with the whole business of the coast survey of that great empire. One hydrographer, and with only ten vessels until lately, conducts the whole survey of coasts under the laws of that empire—surveys not confined to the British Isles, but to the British possessions in the four quarters of the globe—and not merely to their own possessions, but to the coasts of all countries with which they have commerce or expect war, and of which they have not reliable charts—even to China and the Island of Borneo. Rear Admiral Beaufort is now the hydrographer, and has been for twenty years; and he has no civil astronomer to do the work for him, or any civil superintendent to overlook and direct him. But he has somebody to overlook him, and those who know what they are about—namely, the Lords of the Admiralty—and something more besides—namely, the House of Commons, through its select committees, and by which the whole work of this hydrographer is most carefully overlooked, and everything brought to the

test of law and expediency in its inception, and of economy and speed in its execution. I have now before me one of the examinations of this hydrographer before a select committee of the House of Commons, made only last year, and which shows that the British House of Commons holds its hydrographer to the track of the law—confines him to his proper business; and that proper business is precisely the work which is required by our acts of 1807 and 1832. Here is the volume which contains, among other things, the examination of Rear-Admiral Beaufort (showing a huge folio of more than a thousand pages). I do not mean to read it; I merely produce it to show, that, in Great Britain, the hydrographer, or naval officer, is charged with the whole business of the coast survey, and executes it exclusively with the men and ships of the navy; and having produced it for this purpose, I read a single question from it, not for the sake of the answer, but for the sake of the facts in the question. It relates to the number of assistants retained by the Rear Admiral, and the late increase in their number. The question is in these words: "In 1834 and 1835, you had three assistants—one at three pounds a week, and two at two guineas a week; now you have five assistants—one at four pounds a week, three at three pounds, and one at three guineas. Why has this increase been made?"

The answer was, that these assistants had to live in London, where living was dear, and that they had to do much work—for example, had printed 61,631 charts the year before. I pass over the answer for the sake of the question, and to contrast them with something in our own Coast Survey. The question was, why he had increased the number of the assistants from three to five, and the compensation of the principal one from about \$800 to about \$1,000, and of the others from about \$600 to about \$800 a year. And turning to our Blue Book, under the head of Coast Survey, I find the number of the assistants of our Superintendent rather more than three or five, and their salaries

rather more than six or eight, or even ten or twelve hundred dollars. They appear thus in the official list: One assistant at \$3500 per annum; one at \$2500; three at \$2000 each; three at \$1500 each; four at \$1300 each; two at \$1000 each; two at \$600 each; one draughtsman at \$1500; another at \$600; one computer at \$1500; two ditto at \$1000 each; one disbursing officer at \$2000. All this in addition to the Superintendent himself, at \$4500 as Superintendent of the Coast Survey, and \$1500 as Superintendent of Weights and Measures, with an assistant at \$2000 to aid him in that business; with all the paraphernalia of an office besides. I do not know what law fixes either the number or compensation of these assistants, nor do I know that Congress has ever troubled itself to enquire into their existence; but if our Superintendent was in England, with his long catalogue of assistants, the question I have read shows that there would be inquiry there."

The speech from which the preceding extract is taken was delivered by Mr. Benton in 1848, and in view of that fact, a remark of "B. B." is repeated: "If this Coast Survey needed retrenchment and reform then, the cogency for it now is greater by ten years farther illustration of its abuses, and by at least as many millions more of cost." Contrast the accountability to which the hydrographer of England is held, and the number and compensation of his assistants, with the parallel features of the U. S. Coast Survey.

A review of this matter of "comparison with foreign surveys," establishes nothing calculated to take the Coast Survey out of the category of institutions which, left to themselves, become corrupt and burdensome. In this case, it enjoys the advantage of being itself allowed to state the force and cost of the enterprises with which it invites comparison. Passing by, as irrelevant altogether, the twaddle about trigonometrical surveys of territory in the heart of a continent, and regarding what is stated concerning the hy-

drographic achievements of foreign countries, the United States are behind them all in results, and beyond them all in cost.

In twenty-eight years, and with an expenditure not differing a hundred thousand dollars from the mere congressional appropriations to our Coast Survey during the last fourteen years, which congressional appropriations do not probably cover one half the whole cost during that term, the kingdom of France finished the surveys of its coast. It is scarcely worth while to strive to parallel a work in the state of our Coast Survey with *un fait accompli*.

The exact value in money of "the indirect levies upon the public property and funds," made by the Coast Survey, is not ascertainable without recourse to the Departments which have borne them. It is believed, however, that they far exceed in amount the sums appropriated directly to the Coast Survey by Congress. It is not likely that since 1849 there has been a year in which a million of dollars has paid the entire cost of the survey, and by its own showing "the hydrographic surveys of England" have been prosecuted upon half that cost, deducing it from an average of twenty years. By the same showing, it appears "the hydrographic surveys of England" have been executed by an annual average of fifteen hundred persons, and unless the data extracted from Coast Survey authorities be erroneous, the United States Coast Survey employs about the same number of persons at precisely double the cost. If "Pub. Doc." could have shown that "not one-third" so many were employed on the U. S. Coast Survey as upon the English, he would but have demonstrated that we pay thrice instead of twice as much for the same service, as that opulent nation. The field of operations of our Survey is great indeed, no inconsiderable portion of the coast of this continent; but from that of "the hydrographic surveys of England," little of all the coasts of this world is to be excepted. It is not easy for national pride itself to escape the conclusion, that

neither in economy nor in efficiency, is our own to be put in "comparison with foreign surveys."

Although the dishonesty of "Pub. Doc." is without bounds, it must be remembered that a newspaper has limits, and much that is proper to be said is of necessity reserved for another opportunity. It is due to the occasion that the statistics paraded by him should receive special notice; few—too few—apprehend their real value, even if founded upon fact. Nothing like them has appeared since "Boz" performed for the "Mudfog Association" the same service which "Pub. Doc." now renders for the Coast Survey. Some elucidation of one or two points raised by "B. B." and which appear to have escaped the eye of "Pub. Doc." was intended. The matters are important, and cannot be treated in the limited space which remains. The character also of the work, for which the Coast Survey enjoys much credit, will be discussed upon another occasion and perhaps before another tribunal.

It may be, that enough has been shown already to demonstrate this proposition; that the cost of the Coast Survey "has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished." The statesman who can read this controversy carefully, will have reason to doubt his own fidelity to duty, if he does not feel that he owes it to his country and to the Coast Survey to leave no means untried to lessen its cost, to increase its efficiency, and to confine it to its proper business. Another proposition, also established by the course of this controversy, is, that its cost no more needs abatement, than its morals need amendment. The citizen who can contemplate with indifference the use of such means of defence as have been exposed, will have cause to distrust his own honesty. Upon what system must an establishment be maintained, which looks for defence to Falsehood, Fraud and Forgery?

B. B.